

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on March 4, 2004.

Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 20 and 21 are amended and as a result, claims 1-21 are still pending in this application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Formal Drawings

Formal drawings are submitted herewith.

Objection to Abstract

The Examiner objected to the Abstract as being too short and not descriptive pursuant to MPEP § 608.01(b). The Abstract has been amended as shown above and should now be in compliance.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang (U.S. 6,035,408). Applicant does not admit that the Huang patent is prior art to the present claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to swear behind the Huang patent at a later date. At this time, Applicant chooses to distinguish the Huang patent from the present claims.

The claims of the present patent application are directed to an integrated apparatus, system and method which integrates at least two previously separate things: a portable computer and a personal organizer. The integrated apparatus includes a high-level processor for running the portable computer software and a low-level processor of the type found in hand-held personal organizers running low-level organizer software. These are separate processors running separate software applications.

The Huang patent describes a computer which has a faster, high-power-consumption processor and a slower, low-power-consumption processor which both run the same software. The operating system and all application software is switched from one processor to the other processor in a power-saving mode. The processor architecture (Pentium®) and the application

software is the same for both processors.

In contrast to the Huang patent, the claims of the present patent application have been amended to include the limitation that the high-level-processor is operating high-level application software and the low-level-processor is operating low-level application software. For example, but not by way of limitation, claim 1 describes the integrated apparatus with the high-level processor operating high-level application software, and low-level-processor operating low-level application software. These elements are described in a similar fashion in claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-21 as amended. These limitations are not found in the Huang patent. Since all of the elements of claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-21 are not found in the Huang patent, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) cannot stand. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-21.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 5, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Cai (U.S. 6,501,999). The Cai patent is characterized as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being removable. Applicant does not admit that the Cai patent is prior art to the present claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to swear behind the Cai patent at a later date. At this time, Applicant chooses to distinguish the Cai and Huang patents from the present claims.

Claims 5, 11 and 17 depend upon claims which are amended as described above. The Claims 5, 11 and 17 now include the limitations that the high-level-processor is operating high-level application software and the low-level-processor is operating low-level application software.

The Cai patent is similar to the Huang patent in that the same software runs on either processor. Thus there is no difference between the processors from the application software's perspective.

These limitations are not found in the Cai or Huang patents. Since all of the elements of claims 15, 11 and 17 are not found in the combination of the Huang and Cai patents, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot stand. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 5, 11 and 17.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6904) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

WIN S. CHENG

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6904

Date

July 2, 2004

By

Daniel J. Kluth
Daniel J. Kluth
Reg. No. 32,146

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 2 day of July, 2004.

KACIA LEE

Name

Kacia Lee

Signature